

*Supplementary Estimates*

Moreover, there is no proof that even if such provisions were extended to all women, they would necessarily benefit women. From Canadian experience as well as from the experience of other countries, some of which do have earlier retirement age for women, three facts stand out: first, women live longer than men; second, their total time spent in the traditional labour force is, on average, shorter than that of men; third, they are generally paid at lower rates than men. However, I suggest that under the present government this situation is changing rapidly in light of the status of women report that has been presented. These considerations, particularly under a contribution-related social insurance plan such as the Canada Pension Plan and the Quebec Pension Plan, translate into a longer retirement period at a lower income for women than is the case with men. This is hardly to women's advantage.

The government is also reluctant to discriminate on the basis of occupation, as the motion in question implies. In addition to general opposition to the concept of occupational discrimination, the proposal to select nurses in particular raises a number of fundamental issues. Again I repeat that my own wife is a nurse, and I am sure she will be reading *Hansard* this week and will agree with what I say.

I notice that my time is about to be terminated when I should have another 15 minutes, Mr. Speaker, but as a last thought I might add that I and my Liberal colleagues are far from being insensitive to the problem that befalls older nurses, one indeed which is shared by many other Canadians both male and female and who, because they have not reached retirement age, must carry on working. I nevertheless firmly believe, as the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) stated earlier in the House, that the solution lies not through bringing about a broad expansion or general lowering of pension benefits to those who are 60 or 55 years or age, but rather through a system of guaranteed income or income supplementation that is available to all regardless of age, former occupation, present condition or sex. This is what the social security review is all about.

● (1800)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, before calling it six o'clock perhaps the House would agree to resume the work of committee of the whole on Bill C-45 and authorize the House to go into committee for that purpose. Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (C), 1974-75

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-45, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money

[Mr. Condon.]

for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1975—Mr. Chrétien—Mr. Penner in the chair.

On clause 2—\$365,000,000 granted for 1974-75.

**The Deputy Chairman:** It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at five o'clock for private members' hour I had made a few comments and indicated to the Chair that I assumed the regulations referred to in vote 53c would be the same regulations which were promulgated in respect of vote 52a. The minister nods his head and I am glad to see that. I had assumed that was the case, and although the vote itself does not say what the regulations are, I assume they are the same. I would be glad if the minister would so indicate when he speaks. Although the regulations are complex, they seem to follow generally the same pattern that would have been contained in Bill C-32, plus the experience that the government has derived as the result of administering the regulations.

The only other thing I want to do now is refer the committee to the exchange of questions and answers between the hon. member for Calgary Centre and the Minister of Finance on Friday, December 13, as recorded at page 2232 of *Hansard*. It was to be expected, of course, that the issue raised by the hon. member would be reflected in the House. Although the Minister of Finance did not give a positive answer—and I do not expect the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources will be able to give us one today—I think I should put on the record my views and the views of other hon. members because they embody the principle pursuant to which the House worked out this arrangement by which we could proceed to provide to the government the authority which it needed immediately, without having to become embroiled in the challenges inherent in certain provisions of Bill C-32. I think that is a very sensible arrangement.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre asked the Minister of Finance about the intentions of the government following the actions of the Premier of Alberta, shortly before the premier indicated the initiatives the provincial government was taking vis-à-vis royalties and the need to provide incentives for provincial development, exploration and discovery of new sources of energy. One does not need to become particularly eloquent or to borrow words from the poets to say simply that there is a grave situation not only in Canada but in the world. That is difficult for us to get used to, accustomed as we are to being told about the vastness and greatness of our country and how much energy and other resources we have. It is now obvious that we are coming to a critical period which could mean shortages in the immediate and in the more distant future.

So there is a need on the part of everyone, particularly this government, to do what we can to act as a catalyst in